

[View this email in your browser](#)



## Carmel River Steelhead Association

Advocating for Steelhead Since 1974

*Fish Tales*  
Monthly Newsletter



**December 2020**



**Click Link To DONATE:**

<https://www.montereycountygives>

On behalf the entire CRSA board of directors, we **THANK YOU** in advance for your support. We can save what's left of the steelhead populations and make them whole once again if we continue to further their cause!

**Mark Your Calendar!**

CRSA's Annual Member's Meeting with be held via ZOOM on **Jan 21st!**

## **PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE**

**Written By Steve Park**

CRSA being a non-profit volunteer grass roots organization requires that it find sources for funding its STEELHEAD trout advocacy.

Funding has come from many sources over the years like personal donations and fundraising events like past "Wild Steelhead" BBQ's.

CRSA has received funding from the mitigation dollars put up by Cal Am. Those dollars have funded projects like the large woody debris install located in the south side waterway of the Carmel River Lagoon.

For the first time, CRSA applied for and was awarded entry into the Monterey County Gives (MCGIVES) funding campaign. This partnership with MCGIVES will allow CRSA an opportunity to reach out even further in its advocacy for the Carmel River and its steelhead fish populations. The potential funding from MCGIVES improves and allows for more CRSA equipment replacement, rescue projects and projects like PIT tagging will be possible.

At fish tales press time CRSA donations were closing in on 10K for a total to date. James Jeffery (JJ) the current CRSA BOD secretary donated 5K as a challenge gift for others to match. Various individuals, their companies and managers of some local resorts have been contacted and our hopes are high that they will partner with CRSA and match JJ's challenge.

It would be nice to have grants, charitable donations, and the like always available for CRSA projects, although not the case. The grants are difficult to come by and charitable donations are pretty much the main CRSA funding source, but on occasion funds do appear from unexpected entities.

The MCGIVES campaign runs until DECEMBER 31. Any and all donations are appreciated and will go directly to the furthering of the CARMEL RIVER STEELHEADS' survival.

## **CONSERVATION REPORT**

**Written By Brian LeNeve**

In the last issue I talked about Cal Am withdrawing its permit application for the Desal Plant and what that means for the Peninsula and for steelhead. Now I will dust off my crystal ball and discuss where we are going into the future.

I realize the last article as well as this article are long and detailed, so if you do not want to read the whole article the bottom line is (trying to be as unbiased as I can), if we consider all the available water and all the projected needed water, without a desal plant we will be between 854-AF and 3,299-AF short of what we will need. Please read the remainder of the article and let me know if I am wrong.

In the last issue I gave tables showing current water production and availability and discussed past demand. When I made the table, I showed a deduction for waste and used 10% as a waste factor. Since then, thanks to help from another CRSA member and Cal Am, it appears that waste is now down to 5-7% (good work Cal Am) and waste is actually accounted for by increasing the demand numbers, so I have taken waste out of the available water table and it appears below.

	Best availability	Moderate availability	Low availability
Carmel River	3,376-AF	3,376-AF	3,376-AF
Seaside Basin	774-AF	774-AF	774-AF
ASR	1,300-AF	778-AF	679-AF
Sand City Desal	94-AF	90-AF	86-AF
PWM I	<u>3,500-AF</u>	<u>3,130-AF</u>	<u>2,760-AF</u>
Total available water	9,044-AF	8,148-AF	7,675-AF

I also showed three different time-frames of customer demand that includes waste.

10-year average demand	5-year average demand	3-year average demand
10,863-AF	9,825-AF	9,817-AF

If we combine the two tables, we see the shortfall based on different criteria.

	Best availability	Moderate availability	Low availability
Available water	9,044-AF	8,148-AF	7,675-AF
10-year average demand	<u>10,863-AF</u>	<u>10,863-AF</u>	<u>10,863-AF</u>
Shortfall	1,819-AF	2,715-AF	3,218-AF

	Best availability	Moderate availability	Low availability
Available water	9,044-AF	8,148-AF	7,675-AF
5-year average demand	<u>9,825-AF</u>	<u>9,825-AF</u>	<u>9,825-AF</u>
Shortfall	781-AF	1,677-AF	2,150-AF

	Best availability	Moderate availability	Low availability
Available water	9,044-AF	8148-AF	7,675-AF
3-year average demand	<u>9,817-AF</u>	<u>9,817-AF</u>	<u>9,817-AF</u>
Shortfall	773-AF	1,669-AF	2,142-AF

As you can see under any analysis, we do not have enough water to even cover where we are now and nothing for uptick in usage or what happens when the CDO is removed. At best we are short 773-AF and at worst we are short 3,218-AF.

I should not have to go further to make everyone realize we still need the Desal Plant but since the opponents of the desal say there is a Phase II of Pure Water Monterey (PWM II) we will include that in the analysis.

PWM II promises 2,250-AF of water. As of this date that water source is not secured as the Water One, (the recycled water agency) board of directors has not certified the EIR. Water One is made up of government agencies from all over the county and the agencies in the Salinas Valley have voted no twice and the agencies on the peninsula have voted yes twice with the Salinas Valley votes a majority. I cannot say for sure why it is geographical but, in all likelihood, Salinas wants the waste water which originates in the Salinas Valley to stay in the Salinas Valley either to percolate into the ground water or to be used in other ways in the Salinas Valley.

If, and this is a big if, PWM II gets approved it could at best provide 2,250-AF of water. That would bring our best-case scenario to a surplus of 1,477-AF of water and our worst-case scenario to a shortfall of 968-AF. Even this best-case scenario would not allow the State Water Resources Control Board to remove the Cease and Desist Order (CDO) because Cal Am could not certify they have enough water to meet demand right now based strictly on the best-case scenario, they would also have to consider the worst-case scenario. Remember this is just to be where we are right now and without any additional demand for water.

**What would it take to have water for the future?** Right now, if every water source is maxed out and working perfectly, we have enough water, but only because of a building moratorium and severe conservation. Fantasize for a minute about what could happen if a desal plant were built guaranteeing us an additional 6,252-AF of water. First the CDO would be removed and then: People could indulge in long showers, people could grow lawns, restaurants could actually serve water, hotels could do laundry on site rather than send it out of the area, affordable housing could be built, people could add a bath to their house, people with “lots of record” could get a water meter set and build or sell the lot, we could have a tourism bounce back. All of this will only happen after we have adequate water and the CDO is removed.

How much water would it take to get all of these things? How much water would it take go from where we are now to where we will be in the future? We can look at the “Supply and Demand for Water on the Monterey Peninsula” issued by MPWMD and Cal Am’s response to that supply and demand letter. The Supply and Demand letter used a high and low number for future demand. The table below shows what MPWMD stated in 2018 and what they stated in 2020. I could not find an easy number to fill in for increase in existing customer use and MPWMD in their analysis apparently did not feel existing customers would increase use after 20 years of draconian conservation. I believe existing customers will start using more water once it is available. If we were to increase usage only 10% (that would be going from 56 gallons of water per person per day to 61.6 gallons per day which is still below the state average usage) the increase would be 1,040-AF. I have added that

increase to what MPWMD projects as future demand.

Below is a table of what we will need in the future, how much more water we will need going forward.

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2020</u>
Legal lots of Record	1,181-AF	984-AF
Tourism bounce back	250-AF	175-AF
Pebble Beach buildout	325-AF	132-AF
Increase in existing customers	<u>1,040-AF</u>	<u>1,040-AF</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,796-AF</b>	<b>2,331-AF</b>

If we add our **2018** projected additional demand of 2,796-AF of water to our best-case scenario of a surplus of 1,477 we would have a shortfall of 1,319-AF of water. If we take our worst-case scenario of a shortfall of 968-AF and add the 2018 projected demand of 2,796-AF we have a shortfall of 3,764-AF.

If we add our **2020** projected additional demand of 2,331-AF to our best-case scenario of a surplus of 1,477-AF we still have a shortfall of 854-AF. If we take our worst-case scenario of a shortfall of 968-AF and add the 2020 projected demand of 2,331-AF we have a shortfall of 3,299-AF of water. All of this is assuming PWM II will come on line and produce the whole 2,250-AF. If that falls short, we are missing even more water.

Having a shortfall of between 854-AF and 3,299-AF based on the PWM II project (which is not a given) is not where I want to be. If PWM II does not come on line, having a shortfall between 3,079-AF and 5,524-AF is not where anyone should want to be.

## You May Also Enjoy The Following Articles:



# Grow Fast, Die Young: Is Climate Change Making Fish Age Faster?

The Fish Report, [FishBio](#)

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2020



Humans and other endothermic, or “warm-blooded” animals have the luxury of a built-in temperature control system. For ectothermic animals like amphibians, reptiles, and fish, maintaining body temperature isn’t as easy – especially in the face of climate change. “Cold-blooded” animals can modify their temperature through behavior, such as basking in the sun or hiding in the shade, but are more vulnerable to fluctuating temperatures than their warm-blooded cousins. With global temperatures predicted to increase by up to 4°C by 2100, [CLICK TO READ THE FULL ARTICLE.](#)

--This post featured in the FISHBIO weekly e-newsletter, the [Fish Report](#). You can subscribe to the Fish Report [here](#).

## Tire dust killing coho salmon returning to Puget Sound, new research shows

[The Seattle Times](#), Environmental

Dec. 3, 2020 | Written By [Lynda V. Mapes](#)



First they circle. Then they gasp at the surface of the water. Soon they can’t swim. Then they die.

For decades now, scientists have known something was killing beautiful, adult coho salmon as soon as they hit Seattle’s urban waters, ready to spawn. They had escaped the orcas, the fishermen, traveled thousands of miles, only to be mysteriously killed as soon as they finally reached home.

In a breakthrough paper published [CLICK TO READ THE FULL ARTICLE.](#)

**CRSA Membership**

**Donate**

**CRSA Officers**

President: Steve Park  
831-601-8649  
stevepark@razzolink.com

Vice President: Frank Emerson  
O: 831-655-3626  
M:831-277-0544  
frank.t.emerson@gmail.com

Treasurer: Brian LeNeve  
831-624-8497  
brian@brianleneve.com

Secretary: James C. Jeffery III  
831-659-0804  
jim@jamescjeffery.co

Conservation Chair:  
Brian LeNeve  
831-624-8497  
bjleneve@att.net

Newsletter Editor:  
Hallie Heath

Web Master:  
Julie Dalton  
newsletter@carmelsteelhead.org

**CRSA Board of Directors**

Robert Stoddard  
541-954-9477  
rhstoddard@gmail.com

Tom Pelikan  
831-601-8270  
tbpelikan@comcast.net

Hallie Heath  
707-502-6614  
hcheath487@gmail.com

Luke Coletti  
ljc@groknnet.net

Erik Scarr  
erikscarr3@gmail.com

Jaime Eltit  
jeltit7@gmail.com

Miranda A. Taylor  
209-202-8720  
mat755@humboldt.edu



---

*Copyright © 2020 Carmel River Steelhead Association, All rights reserved.*

Want to change how you receive these emails?  
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#).

